

Appln. No.: 09/751,489  
Corrected Amdt. Dated February 9, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated September 30, 2004

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, because Figures 5A-5D are said to be cross-sectional views of various embodiments of the invention; but the drawings do not show from where these sectional views are taken. Lines 6-13 of page 4 of the Specification have been amended to indicate that Figures 5A-5D look in the direction of mail piece motion.

The Examiner noted some inconsistencies between Figure 1 and Figure 2. Will the Examiner please approve the corrections to Figure 1 that Applicants have indicated in red, which corrections overcome the Examiner's objection. Applicants have enclosed new formal drawing of Figure 1 which includes the corrections shown in red.

Will the Examiner approve the corrections indicated in red on Figure 5D? Applicants have enclosed a new formal drawing of Figures 5C and 5D which include the correction indicated in red.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for not clearly defining the term "mail piece intake section" as it is used in claims 1, 9 and 11. The term "mail piece intake section" has been removed from claims 1 and 11, as amended. Claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 20 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112 for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The specification and claims have been amended to comply with the written description requirement.


Appln. No.: 09/751,489  
Corrected Amtd. Dated February 9, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated September 30, 2004

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 20 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 20, as amended, are not indefinite.

Claims 21 and 22, which depend on claim 11, have been added.

In view of the above claims 1-8, 11-20, as amended, and new claims 21 and 22 are patentable. If the Examiner has any questions, would the Examiner please call the undersigned at the telephone number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ronald Reichman  
Reg. No. 26,796  
Attorney of Record  
Telephone (203) 924-3854

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000